

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application	)	PATENT APPLICATION
	)	
Inventors: Bloch et al.	)	
	)	Art Unit: 2142
Application No.: 10/092,010	)	
	)	Examiner: Ailes, Benjamin A.
Filed: March 5, 2002	)	
	)	Customer No. 28554
Title: PRESENTATION SERVER	)	
	)	

Interview Summary Regarding Telephonic Interview Held On January 30, 2008 Between  
Examiner Ailes and Applicants' Undersigned Representative

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 30, 2008. This summary is being filed with a response to the non-final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007. The response includes a further discussion of the interview. A summary of the interview is as follows:

(A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted;  
None

(B) Identification of the claims discussed:

Claims 1, 7, 8, 28, 52, 62, 73 and 76.

(C) Identification of specific prior art discussed:

Wu, Davis, Ausems

(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner:

None.

(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner:

Regarding claim 1, Applicants argued that it would not be obvious to combine Wu with Davis because Davis does not provide requested content to a rendering entity or perform compiling. The Examiner argued that Davis shows contacting an external server.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants argued that an applet is not a plug-in to a browser, and that Wu uses a compile code rendering engine software 12 on a hardware thin platform 10 (Fig. 1), not a plug-in. The Examiner argued that an applet is plug-in software.

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Applicants argued that Wu's device cannot process a media file as claimed. The Examiner indicated that he would re-evaluate his rejection to this claim.

Regarding claim 52, Applicants argued that Wu does not identify a type of a rendering entity from a group of rendering entities. The Examiner argued that this could occur with Wu, but that he would re-evaluate his rejection to this claim.

Regarding claim 62, Applicants argued that Wu's device does not have the capability to process a .SWF media file. The Examiner argued that .SWF media files are known and that Wu could be provided with this capability.

Regarding claim 73, Applicants argued that Wu's device cannot be a Flash player because Wu's device does not have the capability to process Flash data. The Examiner argued that Flash players are known and that Wu could be provided with this capability.

Regarding claim 76, Applicants argued that transforming media content to JPEG or GIF format is different than the mere use of such content by Ausems. The Examiner argued that the use of JPEG and GIF files is known.

Applicants' detailed rebuttal is discussed in the enclosed response.

(F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed:

None

(G) General results or outcome of the interview:

It was agreed that Applicant should submit a response to the pending non-final Office Action which clarifies his arguments and addresses the cited references in more detail, and that the Examiner would consider such arguments.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2008

By: /Ralph F. Hoppin/  
Ralph F. Hoppin  
Reg. No. 38,494

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660 x214  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665